DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 051 SP 024 968

AUTHOR Peterson, Ken, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Teacher Career Ladders in Utah: Perspectives on Early Stages.
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City. Instructional Leadership Academy.
SPONS AGENCY Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
PUB DATE 2 May 84
NOTE 48p.; Transcript of a Panel Presentation of the Utah Instructional Leadership Academy (Salt Lake City, UT, May 2, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Career Ladders; Change Strategies; *Educational Legislation; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; School Districts; Secondary School Teachers; State Programs; State School District Relationship; *Teacher Associations; Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Utah

ABSTRACT

The status of teacher career ladders in Utah is discussed from five different perspectives. Jim Wilson, representing the Legislative Research Analyst's Office and General Counsel of the Legislature, speaks about legislative intent from the past year and what legislators thought would happen and wanted to happen regarding career ladder bills which have been introduced. He also offers insights into what legislators think educators are doing with the career ladder issue. Don Ulmer, of the Utah Educational Association, discusses the activities of teacher groups in the state, ideas they have, and assistance they have received. Nick Franklin, president-elect of the Alpine Educational Association, addresses the career ladder issue from a teacher's perspective. Tony Mitchell, Superintendent of the Park City School District, talks about a superintendent's perspective and current potential problems of career ladders. LeRue Winget, from the Utah State Office of Education, describes the approval process for local education agencies' plans for teacher career ladders. A session for comments from the audience follows the presentations. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246051

TEACHER CAREER LADDERS IN UTAH :

PERSPECTIVES ON EARLY STAGES

Transcript of a panel presentation of the
Utah Instructional Leadership Academy --
May 2, 1984

University of Utah

Ken Peterson, Director & Moderator
Jim Wilson, Utah Legislature, Office
of Legislative Research & General Counsel
Don Ulmer, Utah Educational Association
Nick Franklin, Alpine School District
Tony Mitchell, Park City School District
LeRue Winget, Utah State Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ken Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Utah Instructional Leadership Academy is sponsored by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research & Development, and is a research dissemination activity of the Lab. However, views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the Far West Laboratory, and no endorsement is implied.

SP024968

UTAH INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ACADEMY 1983 - 84

ACADEMY DIRECTOR: KEN PETERSON
ACADEMY COORDINATOR: VICKI LAMBERT

INVITATIONAL GUEST MEMBERSHIP

Adamson, Harley	Weber State College
Allred, Wallace	BYU
Barlow, Haven J.	State Senator
Bauer, Allen	Murray School District
Baum, Lowell	UEA
Bell, Boyd	Carbon School District
Bell, Nikki	PTA State Office
Benowitz, Nanette	League of Women Voters
Bergera, James	Provo School District
Black, Alden	Garfield School District
Bradford, Dick	State Representative
Bullough, Bob	U of U
Burningham, Kim	State Representative
Cendese, Ivan	SL School District
Chatelain, Tim	Weber School District
Coombs, Garn	BYU
Cowan, Bill	Utah Office of Ed
Crook, Wayne	Beaver School District
Davies, Donna	PTA State Office
Dunlap, Anna Marie	Governor's Office
Eberhard, Charles	South Sanpete District
Farnsworth, Brian	Murray School District
Finlinson, Reece	Millard School District
Fowles, Jack	Millard School District
Franklin, Nick	Alpine School District
Griffin, Bruce	Utah Office of Ed
Hall, Steve	UEA
Hansen, Merrell	Provo School District
Hansen, Hurley	UEA
Howe, Bryant	Legislative Research
Jackson, Tom	Rowland Hall-St. Marks
Keetch, Gary	Alpine School District
Kendell, Rich	Utah Office of Ed
LeFevre, Clifford	Weber School District
Lewis, Wayne	Legislative Research
Lubomudrov, Carol	Rowland Hall - St. Marks
Lund, Bruce	UEA
Martin, Millie	Granite School District
Martinez, Izar	Utah State University
McDonald, Marcie	Granite School District
Mecham, Steve	Weber School District
Miskel, Cecil	U of U
Mitchell, Anthony	Park City School District
Morgan, Stanley	SL School District
Morgan, Tony	U of U
Morris, J. Clair	Iron County District
Mower, Dennis	Duchesne School District
Nelson, Rulon	Nebo School District
Newman, Charlotte	League of Women Voters
Owen, Tom	Jordan School District
Pappas, Peggy	PTA State Office
Peterson, Steve	Washington District
Pyne, Clifton	Alpine School District
Raat, Gerald	Ogden School District
Reese, William	Weber School District
Richards, Don	Utah Office of Ed
Rummler, Roy	Morgan School District
Steed, Grant	Davis School District
Ulmer, Don	UEA
Webster, Mark	So. Utah State University
Weise, Suzanne	Guadalupe Center
Wilson, Jim	Legislative Research
Worthen, J. Frank	Carbon School District

TEACHER CAREER LADDERS IN UTAH: PERSPECTIVES ON EARLY STAGES

MINUTES OF UTAH INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP MEETING
May 2, 1984

Ken Peterson, University of Utah
Moderator and Editor

The Utah Instructional Leadership Academy is sponsored by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, which is located in San Francisco. It is hosted by the College of Education here at the University of Utah. Our purpose is to give people from school districts, state government, and lay groups a chance to talk together on educational issues. We have the opportunity to look at some of the details and talk over what's going on in education without the political pressure and conflict that we run into in other settings. Our topic today of career ladders is one that has engendered a lot of controversy and discussion. It is an ideal topic for the Utah Instructional Le adership Academy.

In two weeks, Utah public school districts will submit plans for career ladders to the Utah State Department of Education for an approval process. What we're looking at today is an update and progress report from a number of points of view of what's happening to career ladders in Utah.

The professional and political implications of career ladders are great. Nationwide, there's a great deal of attention focused on Utah because we're developing so many different plans for career ladders and trying them out at local levels. The National Education Association has a committee working now that we hear will lead to some recommendations about career ladders for teachers across the country. They will be attending to what happens in Utah. The U. S. Department of Education has made career ladders and teacher incentives through career ladders, one of their main research topics. A number of state

legislatures are considering career ladders as one means of school reform.

As educators, we talk about different ways of making the profession more attractive, to enable teachers to do the kind of work they want to do; that is, working with kids, working academically, and receiving recognition and reward for the important role that they play in society. And, so it's going to be important as we work with career ladders not just to work on the details of getting ready for May and programs in place for September, but to keep in mind that one of our goals is to create a more potent and powerful place for teachers within the school system and society.

We shouldn't be naive about developing career ladders. If we're interested in improving education very quickly, there are some other interventions that would work faster. Decreasing class size or raising teachers' salaries across the board would all get to the task of reforming education much faster. However, career ladders are the political game in town. If you want to play basketball, you play The Jazz tonight. If you want to work on school reform in Utah, you work on career ladders, it is the educational reform game in town. And, so, we invite anyone who's interested in the topic of improvement in Utah public schools to join us in looking at career ladders and doing the best we can with those.

The work that's gone on so far, and I've had a chance to work with ten career ladder committees in this State, is impressive. Teachers, administrators, and parent groups have done a great job in getting involved and discussing the possibilities for career ladders. But the plans that are approved this May stand to be improved by the experience we get next year. One of the things to keep in mind is that the plans that are approved this spring are good ones to get started with, but let's see what happens with them next year and be

ready to improve them. I think, also, we're going to have to realize that the amount of money that is allocated for career ladders is probably enough to get the idea underway, but, if we're serious about rewarding the educators who work within that system, then a considerable greater amount of money is needed.

Today we have a panel that I think is going to be helpful for getting started some ideas about the status of career ladders in Utah. First, we have Jim Wilson, from the Legislative Research Analyst's office and General Counsel of the Legislature. I've asked Jim to talk about legislative intent from last year about what legislators thought would happen, and wanted to happen. And, also, to the extent that he can, reflect what he hears about legislative perspective these days: What do legislators think that educators are doing with the career ladder issue and where do they think we're going with it?

We have Don Ulmer, from the Utah Educational Association. I've asked Don to talk about what he sees from his perspective as teacher groups around the state have worked very hard on career ladders, what kinds of ideas they have, what kind of assistance they've had. And, to give us an update from UEA perspective on what the potentials are for career ladders to improve the profession.

Nick Franklin is president-elect of the Alpine Educational Association and is the teacher leader for the Alpine District's career ladder committee. The Alpine District Committee is one of the most active I saw in the state in terms of the size, the number of people they worked with, and number of meetings. Other teacher groups worked hard, but I think the Alpine District was really notable in the efforts those folks put in. Nick is going to talk about a teacher's perspective of what career ladders look like, and also

what the process has looked like to him as a leader of a group from the district level.

Tony Mitchell is Superintendent of the Park City School District. I've had a chance to work with the folks in the Park City District on their career ladder plan, and I've been very excited about the developments there. I've asked Tony to talk about a Superintendent's perspective, and what he sees to be some of the potential problems right now of career ladders.

Each of these presenters is going to talk for about ten to twelve minutes to begin with and then the bulk of our time I'd like to reserve for LeRue Winget, from the Utah State Office of Education. I've asked LeRue to describe the approval process that's coming up this May; what the State Office is going to be looking for; what kinds of time lines they have; some of the details of the process. But, also to look at the future, and what might be happening in the next year or so with career ladders to the extent that any of us can tell.

Following that, I'd like to open up the session for comments from you in the audience, hearing about your experiences with career ladders. Also, to ask questions of panelists and LeRue. And we invite panelists to add comments and ask questions at that time.

I'd like to start off with Jim Wilson, from the Legislative Counsel's office to talk about some of the early legislative intent.

Thank you very much, Ken. Just by way of introduction, I might say that a perception of politicians here in the state was best related in a conversation I had with a school teacher as we were going through the last legistative session. He described a politician as someone who's sworn into office and then cussed out afterwards.

I sat down this last week and figured out that there were about sixty pieces of legislation that I actually drafted, or helped draft, for the last budget session, which dealt with public education. We certainly had controversial arguments that took place on each and every one of those. When the final count was taken, I think we had about six or seven actual pieces of legislation that passed through that session.

I think that most people tend to forget that legislators, at least in the State of Utah, are really no different than you and I. I thought it would be interesting to you to know that of our twenty-nine senators, four are educators, twelve are business persons and four are attorneys. We have two consultants, one homemaker, five rancher/farmers, and one retiree.

We also have seventy-five representatives: Nine of whom are educators, twenty-eight list themselves as business persons, seven are rancher/farmers, five attorneys, six retirees, three homemakers, and fourteen professionals.

I've worked for the legislature for approximately three and one half years and I don't suppose I've had a more frustrating three weeks than the time that we spent when we actually got down and attempted to put into legislative language what a career ladder should be. I hope that all of you would realize that when you're talking about a part-time legislature, as we have right now, one which meets in a budgetary session for twenty days, that you're talking about individuals who set aside the kinds of things that they're doing, the backgrounds they come from, and go up and attempt to represent their constituents. They attempt to represent what they see, what they hear, and what they understand are the concerns of those individuals.

I hope you also appreciate the fact that they bring with them some preconceived biases and diversities of opinions. One of the great educations

that I've received since I've worked with the public education is that everyone is an expert in education. I suppose the reason is that everyone has at one time been in school, or has children or grand children who are now in school. And, so everyone has their own preconceived ideas of the challenges and the problems which exist in the public school system. Also, they have their own opinions regarding how those challenges might best be met.

I just give this to you by way of brief introduction, and a reflection, as you stop to think about the legislature. It's been interesting as I've talked with various people, because in the minds of individuals, they see this great, large body of people that are put on a pedestal, somehow separate and apart from the general public. And, they don't stop to think that these people really are no different than you and I, other than the fact that they're apt to get together and make laws or consider laws from the perspective and standpoint of the general populous of the state. And, so, I hope you'll have that in mind as we talk about the perspective that these legislators have about this thing called career ladders.

There actually were two or three different career ladder bills that were floated around in the legislature this last session. Rep. Kim Burningham was the major sponsor of one. Rep. Bob Garff was the major sponsor of another. And Rep. Lloyd Frandson was the sponsor of, not a bill, but at least a similar line of thought and it dove-tailed quite nicely with career ladders. As the session got started and legislation was being drafted, I think the legislature came to grips with the real frustrations of the fact that concerns about the quality of education had been expressed in national and state reports, and what we were going to do in twenty days was to do away with all those concerns, and right all the wrongs and problems that had existed for some time. It became a very frustrating exercise. Not only for the staff, but for the legislature as well.

Some ad hoc committees had been formed and made some recommendations, quite a few recommendations, as a matter of fact. The general feeling that I received from all of our legislators was that there was certainly a need that existed in the educational community to do something. The questions was: What? And how that need might best be addressed? And, so during the session, we had several formal and informal groups that got together and tried to come to some kind of consensus that they felt could be put into a manageable legislative mandate that would go out to education, that everyone would feel good about. I think the more we worked, the more we found out that nobody felt good about anything.

A real frustration on House Bill 110, which was the career ladder bill, was that it was not offered by any one individual. And even once it was introduced out on the floor, it was amended several times. One section of the bill set up some mandatory guidelines for district proposals on career ladders. By one small amendment on the floor of the Senate what was mandatory became permissable. So, in effect, though the legislature has shown some intent as to the kinds of things they would like to see in career ladder programs, those kinds of things are not mandatory, under House Bill 110.

If you want to know the true feelings of the legislature in regard to education and teachers, you don't really have to look any further than the First Section of House Bill 110. And, that's the intent language that's in Section 53-54-1. In there, the legislature - the men and women who serve you - recognized, I think, four basic things in regard to teachers.

Number one, they felt that there was a need to recognize the importance of rewarding teachers who strive to improve the quality of education. And quality education seemed to be a theme not only of the legislative session, but of the

six month period that led up to that session. Second, they felt that it would be appropriate to say that they would like to provide incentives for educators to continue to pursue excellence in education. Next, they wanted to reward educators who demonstrate the achievement of excellence, however it is defined. And fourth, they felt that it would be appropriate that educators should be compensated who assume additional educational responsibilities.

They also recognized that people traditionally resist change. We had recognition of teacher excellence and the way in which teachers are compensated or rewarded as topics for reform. As they talked about the kinds of reforms being suggested, they anticipated a certain amount or degree of resistance to any kind of change. I think you need to keep that in mind as you understand the philosophy behind HB-110 and some of the things that were considered, not only by leadership, but by the legislature as a whole.

There is some additional background that is akin to Monday morning quarterbacking, that you need to be aware of. At the time we were putting together the career ladder concept, it had been brought to our attention through research, that no successful state-wide career ladder programs has ever existed in the United States. And, I don't think that has changed any. As a matter of fact, looking at some of the handouts that are available this morning, I see that there are some states which have career ladder programs now running into problems. I think that was part of what was anticipated by the legislature, no matter what was developed, that there would be problems. Because of this, we on the hill looked at career ladders as a dynamic type of tool for rewarding and compensating educators.

One of the hottest things that was discussed was the kind of evaluation used to determine excellence in education. If you're going to have an evaluation system for educators, what kind of a system should you have? The

bottom line on that again was that you were talking about something, that for all intents and purposes right now, our legislature determined did not exist. And, that was reflected, I think, in HB-110. They did not come out and say, "Here's the kind of a system that we would like to have the State Office of Education or the school districts incorporate into a career ladder program and apply that across the board to every district in the state."

The general consensus in the legislature was that if there was going to be a workable career ladder program it would be more appropriate to indicate to the districts, to the teachers, and to the State Office, that the legislature was in favor of such a program, or programs, give some broad general guidelines and then allow the districts to go in and develop their own programs, their own evaluation systems, subject to the general kinds of things that they attempted to put into the bill. Again, some of those even general things, that were mandatory at one point in time during the session, became permissive on the last day.

One of the things that you also might like to be aware of was not planned or anticipated at the time we began talking about career ladders. Rather than mandating a state-wide system, we looked to local development. I think that this approach is going to have excellent results if we can have continuity in our career ladder programs. That is, that instead of having one system that is mandated state-wide, as Ken has alluded to earlier, I think what you're going to see is the development of several good career ladder programs that various districts a year or two down the road may take a look at. And, each one may be adapted to meet the particular needs of one of the forty districts in Utah. I don't think that was the idea at the time the legislation was actually put together. However, hindsight is a great thing to have, and so as

the legislature is looking right now at refinement of career ladder programs, they're going to be very excited about the potential for development. I have gotten some feedback from people in Washington, D.C. about this very thing. The dynamics of being able to look at several different kinds of programs as they relate to the specific and particular needs of the particular district or area are seen as a positive, if unanticipated, feature.

I've outlined some of the basic elements in the career ladder program that came out of the legislature. The first section was the intent section. The second section of the bill set up eight different initial legislative concerns, which were made "shalls" in the program. They dealt with extended contract years, additional pay for additional performance, a consistent procedure for selecting teachers who will be given additional responsibilities, differentiated staffing, and a well-defined program of evaluation. It did not spell out what the program necessarily would encompass; merely the generalities of an evaluation program. The bill made a statement about advancement on the career ladder that related to performance, which became a "may." A later provision in the bill focused at least a portion of the money would be funded for the career ladder into quality education. The feeling was that at least fifty percent of the funds should be earmarked for reward of effective teaching performance. Again, the legislature didn't spell out exactly what constituted effective teaching performance. They said that a portion of the criteria should be tied into student achievement and, again, would allow districts, and the State Office of Education, to come up with the guidelines and criteria to make those kinds of determinations.

The unique feature about this piece of legislation is that the legislature didn't provide any funding for the career ladders in the career ladder bill. I think there came a point in time where the determination was made when we

were struggling so much with just the concepts and the basic ideas that the feeling was to see whether or not a bill would pass. If it did, then the intent was that funding would be provided for in a separate piece of legislation, the school finance bill, which surprisingly did not pass the budget session. Subsequently, in the special session, provision for approximately fifteen and one-half million dollars was made available. That went contrary to some of the funding suggestions that had been promoted by some ad hoc education reform committees in the state.

I'm not going to stand here and try to justify where the dollar amount came from or why it went down to fifteen million. I think it's sufficient to say, though, with the background that we came into this with, and with the urgency of concerns about the newness of the program, there was real concern about the effectiveness of the program, whether or not a career ladder would really fly. On the one hand you have to say the legislature is sympathetic to education and willing to say,

> "Hey, this is something that appears to be attractive. You've got people that think something could go. On the other hand, it's not a proven program. We recognize there may be some problems with the program on implementation, getting into gear, participating in it. Also with the evaluation. We're going to make a good-faith effort to tell education that yes, we think there should be the kinds of things that we recognized in our intent language. Let's go ahead, get it in gear, see how it falls out; give the districts, the teachers, the administrators, parents an opportunity to do something with this plan. Get it into gear, into effect, then come back and we'll go from there."

It's easy to sit back and to second-guess and say, "It would have been great to have forty-four million dollars." It would be wonderful if the only thing a legislature has to consider when they meet is public education. Unfortunately, it isn't.

I'm excited about the program. I've received a lot of positive feedback from the legislature in terms of saying,

> "We had to start somewhere. We feel at least we've shown to education our feelings about the fact that if this is the direction in which they want to go, let's go ahead. Let them have that direction. We won't mandate, we won't restrict them. We'll give them some funding. And if we see some real desire to have these programs go, then I think you're going to see some very positive reactions from the legislature in terms of additional funding for the programs."

I'm speaking now in terms of my perception of what they say. I think legislators realize that we're not talking about something in terms of quality education that's going to change over night. I think they're also saying to themselves, like with any type of legislation that's ever passed, you're not talking about a static thing; you're talking about a dynamic thing. As the system evolves, the legislation may evolve as well. As evaluation systems are developed that prove to be effective, as additional needs are recognized, there may be need to come in and amend the legislation.

My perception has been that there is a very positive response on the part of legislators in terms of giving the program a chance to work, of letting the educational community do their own thing, if you will. The kinds of things, for example, that Provo District is doing to get additional funds to supplement their career ladder programs. I think they're very favorable to them.

In conclusion, let me just say a couple of things. The legislature is concerned. They've got our interim committee very closely monitoring what's going on with career ladders. We've had several proposed programs come in already. We intend to have the State Office of Education and other districts, come in and report on an updated basis to our interim committee

exactly what is going on with career ladders. In House Bill 179, which was sponsored by legislative leadership, there was also direction given to both public education and higher education on all school reform programs, including the career ladder, to come back to the legislature and give a report and to be able to use savings from within the system to promote additional funding of the kinds of programs that proved the most successful in public education. That would include the career ladder.

Leadership has also requested that in November a report be made to our Management Committee on what's going on with the reform programs in the public education sector. So, as far as the interest dying down after the session, let me assure you that the legislature is on top of the concerns of the needs of public education, specifically the career ladder. I think you have to remember, too, that many of the women and men who serve in the legislature have children in the school system. They meet and talk weekly and daily with teachers. Not only as legislators, but as concerned parents and grandparents, for what actually is going on in the teaching system.

Last, but not least, I think you have to realize that legislator turnover is a factor in legislative change. Representatives are up for election every two years, and this is an election year. Two years ago we had a sixty percent turnover in the House of Representatives. So, what you see in terms of the makeup of the House now may not be what it will be in six or eight months down the road. We have right now at least eleven Representatives that I'm aware of, who will not be coming back next year as Representatives. One who has filed for Senate is unopposed. But, the other ten, for whatever reason, will not be coming back. And, that's one change in the makeup of the House just to start off with before elections.

I think that educators, parents, teachers, and individuals that are concerned about education, have a real responsibility. Number one, to keep in touch with whoever is serving in the legislature. If you want to see career ladders continue, and I personally believe right now that we've got enough of a continuity with legislative leadership, that leadership will see to it that that happens. But, you have that responsibility as well.

Number two, we've talked about assertive discipline in another matter of school reform as it relates to kids when they're in school and recognition of positive performance. Legislators don't hear a lot of good things about their performance. I mean, sincere, honest compliments. And, I think a lot of what's fallen out of the last session or received publicity has been of a negative nature. I would say that the other responsibility that education has is to develop an honest, open, and positive dialogue on career ladders and on the performance of the legislature as it relates to their response to the needs of education. Neither educators nor legislators are always in total agreement on educational matters. Yet they all have a concern for education. I think as long as communication lines are open, while there may not be total agreement, educators and legislators are working towards a common goal. I think that you'll see some positive things accomplished in the State of Utah.

Next, Don Ulmer, from the Utah Educational Association.

Over the last couple of months, as part of our preparation for negotiations, we have been planning with and training teachers in every district in in the State. Part of that time has been devoted to a sharing of career ladder plans and procedures. The first thing I'd like to say is that I've never experienced, in my twelve years with the UEA, any activity carried out on such a scale in a cooperative mode among administration, school boards,

teachers, and parents. Every district is seriously involved in planning a career ladder program. That planning involves every aspect of the school community. Educators and others are putting forth a good-faith effort to develop something that makes some kind of sense. While they are working under restrictions, they are working. And, I for one, am impressed by that.

With regard to what's developing, let me just list for you my perception of the kinds of products that are emerging. First, I know of no district where fifty percent of the funds are not being used to extend the school year. Districts may vary as to how they do that, but every district in the state is taking advantage of the line in the legislation that permits fifty percent of career ladder funds to be used to extend the school year for all teachers from two to four days. And I think everyone agrees there's solid educational justification for that. That is, there is some improvement to be achieved by that alone.

Now, with regard to the use of the other fifty percent of those funds, there are three sorts of programs that are being proposed. One is the kind of program that says, "We would like to reward our effective, efficient teachers for being effective, efficient teachers. Submit a dossier, or portfolio, to the committee, (usually joint committee) making the decision. Indicate how wonderful you are, and submit, (I don't use that word negatively at all) to an evaluation procedure, which is also described as part of the program. We will place you, as a result of that application and our evaluation, at a certain level within the district career ladders." Those levels are named a number of different things. Sometimes they are level one, two and three. Sometimes they are provisional, professional, teacher/leader, master teacher, etc.. In some districts it may take as many as six years experience in order for an educator to be placed in the top-most level of career ladder. In other districts, it may only take one year.

The second use of funds is this. The program states, "There are certain things that need to be done in the district to improve education: helping new teachers, developing curriculum, and twn or twelve others. Teachers, submit a proposal for performing those jobs. Proposals will be evaluated and teachers assigned to accomplish that particular purpose. Teachers will be paid on the basis of the job itself and the number of days estimated to complete it." One of the decisions that needs to be made is how will teachers be paid? That varies. Sometimes the decision is to pay on the basis of a daily rate of pay. In other cases, the decision is to pay the person a specific subsidy for the particular job.

The third use of the other fifty percent of funds is a combination of the first two. That is, a number of (I don't mean to be perjorative) "hoops," are set up for teachers to go through. Teachers are given certain credit, a number of points, for each of the hoops they negotiate. For example, teachers are invited to apply and be evaluated. That is one hoop and they will get a certain number of points for that. Teachers who do some additional work get a certain number for that. And then in some cases, a review is made as to how students are performing, separate from these other things. Judg ment is made about that, and a certain number of points are given. In many cases, the specifics of the reward haven't been worked out yet, and as you can tell that is a tough job to do.

Well, those are three things that we've seen. Let me just mention a couple of concerns that still need to be looked at. They aren't impossible to overcome, but they need to be analyzed. One is evaluation. The question to me is "Are we capable at this point, sophisticated enough, to make an evaluation and decide upon a person's pay as a result of an evaluation procedure

over one year or less?" Maybe the only way to find out is to try it out and see. I'm impressed that the evaluation portion of all these programs is the weakest part. It still needs lots of work. Development of job descriptions in connection with evaluation is just one extensive job to be accomplished.

The decision still needs to be made as to the timing concerning the program. I've had a lot to do with one particular district where they were setting up a massive evaluation program and a determination of what teachers would fit on the steps on the basis of that evaluation procedure. They wanted to do it between May 15, when they submitted the application to the State Board, and June 15 in preparation to start the whole thing as of September 1. My impression was that it was absolutely ridiculous to think you could do it in that period of time, before you even had the program approved. We came to the conclusion that at the very least we'd give the teachers time to apply by September 1, look at the names during September, make a decision in October, and then payment would begin somewhat later in the year. In some cases, the decision can be made to do the work, evaluation or decision about jobs and the jobs themselves through the year. Then evaluate at the end of the year and make the payment. But, that decision about where do we start this and where does it end is still tentative.

Let me give you another primary concern that I have about the general career ladders program in Utah. Let's say we can begin all of these things by September, have them all in place, begin to pay people, have the jobs done and evaluations taken care of by September. That would mean that activity would occur in September through part of December. The legislative session begins in January. If anyone in his right mind is expecting any kind of constructive judgement about what good all this is going to do by January,

then he needs to talk to me and explain it carefully. No one is going to be able to say to the legislature in January "We've done it and it's wonderful," or "We've done it and it's a complete bust." And I hope during the next year that message can be gotten to legislators. There is no way that you can determine the result of all this in order to report it in January, or February, or maybe even March. At the very least, it seems to me, a year is needed.

Finally, another aspect of the career ladder program, which has not received enough attention, is an evaluation of the program itself, it's effect on productivity and improved teacher performance or pupil performance and teacher morale, as well as all those things that go into making an excellent school. That evaluation needs to be done in a formal, scientific, systematic way. Teachers, students, parents and administrators need to be a asked about what happened. There needs to be evidence developed to document their opinions. Those data need to be presented in order for us to determine the direction to go from here.

Somebody asked me the other day, "What would you like to see the legislature do in 1985 to change career ladders?" I responded that the greatest danger I can imagine is they make any change. We don't know which direction to go now. We won't know which direction to do in January, either. Some kind of change would just be on the basis of an ad hoc decision by someone who is able to convince somebody else to vote a certain way. I'd hope we would have two years in the same kind of mode to find out which direction we should travel thereafter.

Next, I'd like to ask Nick Franklin to share some of his perceptions as a teacher who's been leading a career ladder committee from the Alpine District.

I'd like to speak from our perspective in the Alpine School District. We've got an all day meeting tomorrow to try to clean up some of the loose ends, and we've still got a couple of months worth of work to do. But, at this point, we feel like we've made significant progress, as have the majority, if not all, the districts in the state.

Our committee is composed of twelve individuals. Five were selected by the local teachers' association, the Alpine Education Association. We selected these people for leadership ability, knowledge of the career ladder bill, and ability to stand up and express what they really felt. They came from different segments of the district: elementary, secondary, and the Association. Five were selected by the School District from among the administrators, central staff, and principals. Each member was selected for their willingness to see the program work. Additionally, two parents were selected to represent several large groups of individuals. We have a person from the Public Involvement Council, which is a group of patrons in our District. Then, we have the regional PTA president, Jan Lewis. There was a joint decision by the administration and the Association as to who would represent the public.

We have felt good about the public input, it's been a tremendous asset. The Committee started out with a lot of concerns, because of the newness of career ladders in this county.

One of our ground rules was that it was a 'no holds barred' situation. We would openly discuss current situations covering administration, teachers, patrons, or students themselves, in an attempt to make a successful program.

We faced a number of problems as we began career ladder planning. First, we were concerned that we didn't have enough money. Next, some of the language,

both of the Bill and the State Office guidelines had several interpretations. In some ways the ambiguity was positive, but in other ways it was a real problem for us.

Some educators were excluded by the guidelines. That presented a lot of problems, because the psychologists, counselors, and library media people do significant amounts of work dealing directly with students. They may not in fact be actually doing direct teaching, but they do directly aid teachers and students.

Perhaps the biggest problem we faced in developing a career ladder plan was that we had such a short time to develop it. We've been going at it for the last two months now. Until we had the final guidelines from the State Office there was no way to do anything. Until then we spent a lot of time spinning our wheels. I suspect that every member of the Alpine Committee put somewhere between seventy and one hundred hours into the program in meetings and talking with teachers. In addition, we read two hundred and fifty to three hundred pages of material. So you can see the size of the effort.

We used a lot of resources. We came to the last Instructional Leadership Academy meeting on teacher evaluation, and incorporated the information presented by the Utah Teacher Evaluation Project. We've had Ken (Peterson) come down and talk to us on two occasions. We've had direct dialogue with teachers and parents. We've talked to Superintendent Winget. We've talked to UEA. We've scanned every piece of information available to us from any school district or any state in the United States which had a bearing on anything that might be considered as career ladders, mentor teachers, and teacher incentives. Anything we could get our hands on, we scrutinized and used.

One area where we used our District specialist was testing student progress. The real concern is how to use student achievement in career ladder systems without disturbing what's already in place, and without destroying a testing program for the District. Ongoing pupil standardized test programs are important and they have specific uses. How do you protect them and still measure student gain for career ladder evaluations?

At the outset of our planning, we indicated that anything that was presented was going to be a unanimous decision. That is a pretty tough commitment. We agreed that we'd be cooperative and work through problems in order to come to a solution that was going to work. We agreed to avoid animosity; that any comments that were made would be taken as general comments, instead of personal. We had a desire to succeed. That was one of the ground rules - we would succeed. We decided that we would develop our own plan. If it went contrary to the types of things done in other places, if it met the guidelines, we'd stick to it. So long as we felt like it was the best we could develop under the situation. Finally, we agreed that what we wanted was what was best for education, as well as educators.

It took two weeks of intensive study and meetings to get us all to work from a common background. We considered a lot of ideas. We looked at extra pay for extra work. We looked at rewarding teachers for doing a good job, or the fact that they're already doing a good job and they're underpaid. We looked at whether we were going to limit the number of people who could participate in the career ladder monies. How far can you extend it; how far can you be realistic? Are we going to allow only ten percent or fifty percent, or whatever, to participate?

We looked at teacher evaluation. How are you going to evaluate the the teacher? We spent fifty percent of the time working in that area and developing a totally new evaluation procedure and document for every teacher beginning with the first-year teacher to the teacher who's been in the District for thirty years. We hope it's going to fly. We hope it's going to work.

How do you assess student gain? Is there a meaningful way of telling are students gaining? I think one of the problems we have in education is the fact that we're not very good at telling the public what's really happening in education. We use standardized test scores, which really don't measure what's being taught in the classroom. In some specific isolated instances, i.e., math, it's pretty easy to tell what's happening. But it does not measure Home Ec, Industrial Arts, PE; it does not measure Utah History and lots of other things. There's really no measure. And, we're just not doing a good enough job of telling the public what it is.

We looked at peer review. We looked at merit pay. We looked at classroom observations by teachers. Talking to Ken (Peterson) and others, we found that the number of peer observations that would be needed would amount to about seven hundred dollars in substitutes' pay for each applicant that was processed. That's at the rate of thirty-six dollars a day. At that point, the only people who are getting money is the substitutes. And there's very little left over for the teachers. Some districts may be able to work out a time-sharing situation. In our district we don't have preparation time for elementary school teachers and no way to release them to look at other teachers without doing this.

We looked at negotiations...there's some nebulous language in there as to what can be negotiated and what can't. That's a difficult situation.

We are making sweeping changes in things that have been negotiated over the years by teachers. For anybody to say that you cannot negotiate items which are already in a negotiated agreement is basically in violation of the law. We had to come to a confrontation with this particular issue and get it...the UEA's got the same problem. We've had to work through this. It took a while to get it resolved. Then, there's those educators that were excluded from the career ladder guidelines.

At this point, how do we feel about our career ladder progress? We feel great. We feel like the program is going to be successful. Ours may not work any place else in the State. Each district is unique and has different requirements. The thing that's been encouraging to us as a committee, as we held our open hearings, is that our people have been patient. There were times when I told them there were a couple of things that were 180 degrees out of what the committee decided that day. Things were in a state of flux and change. We tried to keep them as updated as we could.

Now that we've got a document out, most of the negative comments that we receive come from the semantics of it in some areas that we just didn't define well enough. Other than that, our teachers feel positive about it. We've probably talked to ten or twenty percent of the teachers. We've talked to faculty representatives who have gone back, talked to their people, brought us some questions and then we'd give them the feedback and they've gone back and it seemed to work pretty well.

We're excited as to the long range possibilities if we're allowed to continue to keep the program in process. Teachers feel good about a lack of competition among themselves, i.e., ten percent of the people competing for slots. They feel good about those included in it. They felt good about

it being developed from the ground up instead of coming from the superintendent down. I should mention our superintendent bowed out of the picture, and used his direct leadership only at the first meeting. He said, "This is your program, develop it." That doesn't mean he didn't have some influence. It was a very effective strategy on his part, because it helped the teachers accept the program.

There were no mandates from the District as to what to do, or how to do it. The Committee has come with a unanimous recommendation. And, if you know the people on the Committee, you know that a unanimous recommendation means that they feel really good about it. I think that's a positive thing.

We have broad base support from our people. We do have some opposition, as you might expect, but it seems to be minor. And it seems that we've been able to answer most of these questions and concerns. We also feel like it's going to do a lot in our relationship with our patrons.

Next, we'll hear from Tony Mitchell, Superintendent of the Park City School District.

I appreciate Nick's comment about the wisdom of superintendents bowing out of the process. (Laughter) You should have mentioned that earlier. As some of you know, I'm new to education, so I appreciated the career ladders as a topic, that I started on the same level as everybody else, pretty much at ground zero. We've had a career ladder committee operating in Park City that has met weekly. We have ten teachers and half a dozen school/community council members, administrators, and board members. It's been a very active committee. And we've also had the benefit of Ken Peterson offering a class in teacher evaluation for credit in the school district every Thursday afternoon that has helped to bring us along in terms of evaluation strategies.

It's been a very time-consuming process and one where I think we have a lot of ambivalence about. On the one hand, is all the time and energy taken to develop the career ladder system going to be worth it? Or, would we have been better off having given everyone more money and not developed this whole major superstructure that's been part of the process?

I want to make just a few observations about some of the things I find to be issues and then give a brief description of some of the components of the Park City proposal as of draft number five. First of all, as has been mentioned, the time for implementation is really inadequate. It's kind of like trying to change the tire of a truck while the truck is still going. It's tough to get everything implemented in time, given the constraints that are there. And, I do fear, as Don (Ulmer) mentioned, that the legislature may attempt to make judgements when there's not going to be enough time to gather any kind of evidence regarding the effectiveness of the career ladder system.

We're having a major problem in terms of implementation, about how we need to have people selected for advancement or other responsibilities starting some time during the summer or the very beginning of the school year. How can we do that without having valid kind of criteria available, and still protect the legitimacy of the process that we're developing in the long term? This is one of the things we're finding is the problem of trying to develop a career ladder system. One that can work in the long term, and yet can be implemented in the short term.

One of the other problems we're having in planning a career ladder is designing it for the worst case of administration. I think those in the legislature are aware of this every time there is a restructuring of a State agency. You try to put into it all kinds of checks and balances and safeguards

in case the absolutely worst kind of administration is there. How do you provide enough checks and balances without encumbering the system so much that it becomes unworkable?

One other thing we've found is a number of kinds of ambivalence and contradictions. One of the contradictions: we're losing one of our best teachers. He happens to be the president of the PCEA, heading back to Minnesota because he can make about double there what he's making here as a teacher. Yet, at the same time, he doesn't really support the career ladder approach. Which is probably, as Ken said, the game in town in terms of trying to raise teachers' salaries. So, we're facing that kind of controversy. And the other one of the teacher who says, "You know, I really don't want to get into all of this. Just leave me alone and leave me out of it." Yet, at the same time, wants to be in the middle of making the decisions that affect their professional lives. So, those kinds of contradictions occur as we go through the process.

Let me briefly describe some of the things we're looking at as the Park City career ladder system. We're basically looking at a structure of three ranks: certified teacher, associate teacher, and senior teacher. This would be somewhat similar to the assistant professor, associate professor and full professor in the university system. These would be relatively permanent kinds of ranks or status within the school system. And in order to progress up that career ladder, one presents themselves for promotion. They present themselves for serious review. (Those of you who have had Ken or Don or any of their staff working with you, you'll recognize those kinds of labels that are being placed on things, like serious review.) They can present themselves for serious review before the promotion board, no more frequently than every two years, no less frequently than every five years.

The promotion board will be made up of administrators, teachers, and community representatives.

What they present is their dossier, which is the primary source of information for promotion. That dossier contains those lines of evidence that they have accumulated to support the value, the worth of their teaching. It can include such things as the principal observation, pupil achievement, student reports or surveys, peer review of materials, parent surveys, teacher established performance goals, and other factors such as advanced degrees, district service, evidence of leadership that they may come up with. So, that's the process that they'll go through for promotion from certified teacher to associate and then to senior teacher. We have not established any quotas for those positions.

There is a teacher oversight committee that will receive additional training in evaluation. They will function to advise teachers regarding preparation of their dossier, and also will act to provide scrutiny of the whole system. If a teacher is turned down, that oversight committee will be able to advise them on whether or not they thought they got a fair shake on it, and then there would be an appeal process, if they felt like they didn't.

In addition to the permanent ranks we will establish, we will have an exemplary service teacher, or an additional responsibility kind of status. These would be time limited, one to three years kinds of assignments. They could be for one of three things. First, to recognize exemplary teaching with no additional tasks attached, or, secondly, to meet the needs of the school district, as Don mentioned. There are a lot of things we need; developing of a testing program, a lot of curriculum improvements and so forth.

We will generate those kinds of job descriptions that teachers could apply to work in, such as Department Heads. Thirdly, we will accept teacher-generated proposals for projects that would benefit the school district. In any one of those three areas a person could have a one to three year status as exemplary service or additional service teacher. Those roles would be rotated and there would be additional compensation such as additional money, released time, extended year, or professional perks, like attending the national conventions for their field.

In addition to that, there would still be for the non-tenured teacher, the traditional evaluation process for those cases where there may be problems with the quality of teaching. And that's been one of the problems. How do you allow a teacher to control a dossier and control the information that they will submit for promotion, allowing them up to five years to submit themselves for promotion, and yet still have an evaluation system where if someone isn't able to do it at the end of the first year or second year, you still have a process for remediation or termination.

The framework is there. There are a lot of issues that face us every time we meet. This is a draft #5 that we went over last night and has to be redone now with a number of changes. Many of them simply semantic changes to try to make sure that everyone is understanding things in the same way.

But, the Park City School District, I think, is going to make a committment to put the time and money into the evaluation process and into this career ladder program to make it work. We intent to keep our career ladder committee functioning all year long so that we can continue with refinements and changes as the year progresses.

I think in finishing my remarks, I want to express my appreciation for the kind of assistance we've received from the University of Utah Educational Studies Department and Ken, in particular, and his staff, who

have been up there probably two or three times a week assisting us in the development. It's been very healthy for the board members, the teachers, the public members and of administrators involved to have that kind of facilitator and catalyst as we discuss these issues.

I started out by saying there's a certain ambivalance. I agree with Ken, this is the only game in town right now. Politically there is no other way to go but attempt to jump right in and have the most defensable, rational, supportable kind of career ladder system. And, if five years from now or ten years from now, we have to look in the mirror and say, "It was a lot of work and it didn't really work out," that's fine. Our committment is to make this work, and I think we've got the kind of committment in Park City and the kind of people involved in it that we're looking forward to having a system that does work.

Next, we'd like to hear some thoughts from LeRue Winget about the State Office procedures that are coming up immediately to look at the career ladder plans submitted by districts and some thoughts about how things look for development in the next year or so.

I'm appreciative to Ken and the Academy for getting us together to do some sharing. I think so many of us felt at the time the House Bill 110 was enacted, given the time frame for planning, the matter of the money and so on, we kinda felt like we were hunting bear with a flyswatter. But, I've been encouraged over the period of time, and I've heard some very encouraging comments and statements here today. I believe something worthwhile is coming.

Following the enactment of the Bill, which did have many contradictions in it, we had the task of developing standards and guidelines. We had the input of appropriate groups to help with that, and Jim was helpful to us in the interpretation of the legislature.

The next task that we had, after getting these approved by the Board, and not without some struggle, was to develop an outline to help local agencies. We formed a committee consisting of people like Dave Nelson and Vere McHenry, Craig Kennington, etc. to develop that outline, which we hope has been of some help in the process of plan development.

In the March 30 Administrator's Conference (at Brigham Young University), we held sharing sessions on career plans as they were developing, particularly from a couple of districts who had a little more time for the planning process. We also had some rap sessions, which dealt with teacher evaluation, and we appreciated your help in that regard, Ken, and others.

We've been trying to provide consultant services to districts upon request. We, of course, have not had the amount of in-depth time to give to any one district that a university can give. And, we appreciate the kind of thing the University of Utah has been doing, with the Park City group. Don Ulmer said he also appreciated the kind of money you have up there, Tony (laughter).

On the 18th of April, we made a progress report to the legislature. We're making another progress report to the State Board of Education this Friday. In the report to the Interim Study Committee of the Legislature, we had Salt Lake and Provo Districts report their efforts. This Friday, we'll be having Davis and Morgan report on their studies. And, we've heard a couple of districts here today. All of these things are encouraging that we've heard about these plans.

We have contemplated some long range topics involved with career ladders. Certainly one of them is teacher evaluation. We have in our agency a staff committee to look at the long range aspects of teacher evaluation. Bruce Griffin and Richard Kendall are heading up that committee. We have begun work on a conference on this topic in the early fall. We've been working closely also with Mike Murphy (University of Utah) on the Leadership Seminar and will probably tie it in with that as well as perhaps some broader conference at that time.

Now, as we look ahead, the following comments seem to be appropriate. Let me just remind you that the plans are due the 15th of May, on/or before. We received our first one this morning from the Sevier Valley Area Vocational Center. When you hear me use the term local agencies, it's because in addition to the forty districts, we have the area vocational schools, and schools for the deaf and blind that are also involved. We've not yet received other plans that have been officially adopted by the Boards; although we have bits and pieces from quite a number of them, and one that is ready to go to the Board, the Salt Lake City one. All eligible agencies did declare to us by March 15th that they were going to develop plans. I think Don Ulmer mentioned they're all out there working, along with you.

Some may possibly ask for an extension of time. There is a provision in the standards and guidelines that an extension can be made until June 1, meaning there's an extra two weeks in there, if a district decides to request it. I've only heard of one or two so far that are thinking in that direction.

What happens when the plans come in, on the 15th or before? We've established a committee that will read each of the plans. That committee will make recommendations to the State Superintendent, who will take those

recommendations to the State Board of Education, with any modification of course, that he chooses. We don't anticipate that the Board will be looking closely at each one and attempting to second guess staff. It will be a group of plans that will go to them with recommendations.

What procedures should be followed by the staff committee in making the recommendations? We have another meeting next week in which we'll be trying to firm up the procedure. It was mentioned here today that this is an evolving, dynamic kind of thing. And, we're in a work situation, and I hope that if you have any suggestions that you will feel free to make them. The thinking so far has been something like this. The Committee would develop a checklist based on the standards. As far as to whether the plan is approved or not, it will be based on the standards. These are our criteria.

We felt that each Committee member would be responsible to read them and then we would try to come to consensus. Where we couldn't come to consensus, to have a majority vote.

We've thought about dividing the recommendations into two categories. One, recommended for approval, with no qualifications or with only suggestions. A second category, recommended for conditional or provisional approval. An example might be the insufficient description of the involvement of the groups that have to be involved. In such instance, it might be approved provisionally, but the request made to get a better description in to us.

One of the strengths that I fully agree with is that there is flexibility at the local district level for creativity. A lot of different approaches are being used, and we think that's great. And, so while the standards are

broad, and in a couple of cases a little vague, behind all of that is the intent that the local districts would make some decisions. And, we hope that will be according to your liking.

Any local agency that does not have its plan approved by August 15th will lose its money, and the money will be redistributed by the State Board of Education to the other local agencies.

We're going to have to make progress reports. We can't keep pulling up the tree to see if the roots are growing, but we've got to keep the legislators informed. We can do that through involving them in the planning effort through reporting to them periodically. We did report on April 18th. The question was asked when can we have another report? I suggested to them not until June, anyway, because the plans are just coming in in May. But, we can't report to them more than we can report.

I think there's been another spin-off. As I listened this morning, Nick indicated how much re-evaluation, discussion, and review has been done of practices in the schools. I couldn't help feeling that there's got to be good that comes out of just that - a re-examination of what we're doing, as a basis for improvement.

The money issue is a continuing one. I do think the legislators are verbally committed. As an outsider, I believe from what I've heard some individual legislators say, that there is the willingness to try to put more money into it, depending on how things go. They're making an investment, and if it continues to look good, I personally believe they'll put more money into it.

Wilson: I indicated that anyone that has worked with the legislature, at this session, would have to believe that no matter what their feeling

about the problems associated with educational reform are, that there's a strong desire to support the educational network in Utah. That's across party lines. I think that's a matter of continual relationship with not just education, but the constituency as well. Every time we heard "more money for education," the answer I got from our leadership and from our legislators was "If you want that, get to my constituents and have that word come back to me." Because that's really what we are, a reflection of what the people in the State of Utah want. There's a willingness, a whole-heartedness to support education up on the hill. No question in my mind about that.

Winget: House Bill 110 and the standards that have been developed define an exploratory program born out of compromise. It's exploratory because it's new to public education in Utah and the nation, although elements of it are not new. It's been born of compromise because of necessity. The profession, I believe, has tended to the position that the way to attract and hold talented teachers and provide for quality performance is to raise salaries generally. And to provide for added responsibility. The matter of raising salaries generally is in order that they be competitive with the other professions. The matter of added responsibility entails longer days or extended contracts for the year. I think it's also taken the position, the profession has, that pure merit systems haven't worked.

On the other hand, legislators and a significant segment of the public as well as many educators believe in the principle of basing pay on skills and performance. They believe the current system offers the same salary schedule and the same responsibilities to all teachers throughout the career cycle. It doesn't provide incentives that are commensurate with

comparable professions. And that the likelihood is not there that they will. What I see is the need, and in fact an embodiment in House Bill 110, of some compromise. And, if this thing is going to work, I believe we've got to understand these positions and to draw a little closer to one another. Now, that's just an old soldier talking, one opinion.

A second item - there seems to be some tendency in discussions I've had and in some of the plans - I don't see that in any large measure in the two that we've looked at today - but, some tendency to want to use the fifty percent required to be spent on the advancement on the career ladder for funding short term special assignments. Much as the old teacher/leadership money, rather than truly building a ladder. I'm just a little uneasy about that trend where it becomes the total thing, or the major part of the ladder.

Another question I've wondered, will there be any ladder money spent on beginning teacher level and the second level of the ladder? Does the current funding preclude doing anything significant in these levels unless you happen to be in a fortunate situation like Park City, Ogden, Provo, who have shifted mils from capital outlay to maintenance and operation? I haven't seen in the plans so far much being done at the first couple of levels. It's likely that funding levels preclude this.

The training of principals is a significant question and crucial to the success of progress. Our office is forming an academy for principals. Rich Kendall is working on that.

Peterson: I'd like to open the discussion now for some of your comments and your observations on the progress that you've made in your settings.

Also for questions for the panelists. If anyone doesn't want to do career ladders, we have Adrian Dantley outside to play some one-on-one basketball. And, he says that's the other game in town. Do we have questions or comments?

Question from audience: Can anyone tell me...one sentence in the proposal says, "There will be career ladders developed for administrators." Has any district done that?

Panelist: The place where you would see something on that is in the Governor's Steering Committee on Educational Reform. It's reported in there as a recommendation.

Peterson: One of the bits of unfinished business from the point of an evaluator is that we have to pay attention to administrator evaluation. We need to quickly add it as these plans are developed.

Audience: One of the real dangers of the performance evaluation point of view is using students' information for evaluation of teacher performance. That is using the district standardized test program for teacher evaluation in a rather haphazard way. I think perhaps you could probably pick some good information and destroy its usefulness for other purposes by doing that. Have you worked through that, and how do you get student performance into the teacher appraisal system?

Franklin: We looked seriously at this because it's a real problem. Our solution is to offer the teachers the option of showing their student gain data in one of three ways. The first would be pre- and post-tests developed at the school level by the teacher or by the team, based on the course outlines and objectives which come from district and state guidelines. In other words, something to keep continuity in there and to show that students were in fact progressing. The other option would be to show samples

of student work. This would perhaps be Home Ed., Drama, Music and Industrial Arts. The third option would be to actually chart on a daily basis the progress of the students. Perhaps more at the elementary school than at the secondary level. Although they're beginning to become developed in that way. So, we're requesting that the information come from this type of source. I ought to say that one of the things, one of the problems that we have in our district is that we have a great cross-section. We have some low income areas, we have some high income areas, some reluctance to compare one school with another. Some are reluctant even to compare one class with another. This alleviates this problem and it gives the opportunity to show that in fact the students in a particular class did make gain and it does allow them testing of the information which was in fact presented to the students as opposed to a nebulous situation, where you don't get at what's going on in the classroom.

Peterson: Pupil gain, pupil achievement, is an immediately attractive line of evidence for people. They say, "Well, we don't really care that much about the teacher's background, or style, or approach. What are they doing with the kids? That's what we'd like to know. That's their job, let's evaluate them by what they produce." Not a bad idea. A lot of difficulty in implementation. One of the first ones is, and I wasn't as aware of this as I could have been at the beginning, but you do threaten when you start looking at standardized test results the very important values of those testing programs for pupil diagnosis and for curriculum evaluation. You have to be careful not to lose those functions in our current testing programs. The problem of pupil gain, pupil achievement, for evaluating teachers is another difficulty. We just don't have the tests and the

programs that will get us good, credible, reliable data on the teachers. Our best guess right now, and our advice, which is more conservative than I think the Alpine District is, is that we've got those tests and those programs for maybe about twenty to thirty percent of the teachers in a district. You've got some very good teachers where we just can't get the evidence now about the pupil gain. We don't have the tests and even necessarily the techniques for adjusting for the entering student ability and prior achievement. We're working on that. Probably with some peer review we can increase the numbers of teachers that we can look at through pupil gain to maybe forty to fifty percent of the teachers in the district. But, it is going to take us a while to get to this spot where we could generally look at teachers across the board in terms of their pupil gain. A very attractive idea. No doubt about the value of that information. But, some real difficulties in getting to it.

Ulmer: Using another aspect of that, the aspect of attempting to determine that on the basis of even one year's experience. If a person were to evaluate me on the basis of...as a father, for example, and they chose my performance at the breakfast table, I'd fail yesterday and today, but tomorrow I may be wonderful. And, it appears to me that if I'm going to be evaluated that way it should be over a period of time. And I would think that time period is longer than one year. I do the evaluation and make the judgement in that one year rather than over a period of time, which gives me an opportunity to even out those hills and valleys.

Audience: Don mentioned the importance of evaluating the whole program, not just specific career ladder systems. But, how, if the career ladder concept is not working...is there any way of adjusting that? It seems to me you have to have some sort of empirical evidence.

Wilson: In House Bill 110, we drafted a provision that on the district level there should be incorporated in the concept a plan for periodic review of the system itself. That would include who had been reviewing it, kinds of procedures that would be involved, and the time schedule for that review. Unfortunately, on the last day of the session, where that was a "shall", one of our legislators determined that it would be well to make it a "may". So, rather than mandatory, it now is something that is suggested that they do in their career ladder program. But, it's not mandatory on the district that they do that.

Winget: In the outline we distributed to local agencies under evaluation, we put in:

> "Describe your plan for evaluation of the career ladder program. The following minimum elements should be considered in structuring your evaluation plan. Describe strategies for collection of attitude information concerning effectiveness of the program, from participating and non-participating people, administrators, parents, board members.
>
> B. Describe strategies for collection of relevant information on performance from appropriate sources based on the district's career ladder model."

And the sources listed are students, teachers, schools. And then:

> "C. Describe the strategies for providing a com plete description of the program as it was actually implemented, including the overall program description, job descriptions, the actual process used for evaluating teachers, procedures involved in involving various groups in setting up the evaluation process, descriptions of participants and other pertinent information such as cost."

Then we suggested they ought to have some strategy for gathering data to assess a teacher needs in terms of the ladder. And concluded that in order to work with the legislature we would ask for a local plan to include a progress report by December , telling us what they could tell

us reasonably at that time and an annual report next July. Dave Nelson, for whom I have great respect, was the one that suggested those kinds of evaluation efforts.

We'll be relying to a large extent on the documentation from the State Office as it does come in. I've had a chance to talk with Dave earlier and the interest is there in the State Office and certainly the ability to be looking at that. But, as Tony (Mitchell) says, in four, five, six years, we're going to have to take a very hard look at the strategy all together and see what happens.

Peterson: We do have here at the University of Utah a group that right now is just called Career Ladder Study Group. Don Kauchak, from the Department of Educational Studies, is one of the group. Steve Bossert and Mike Murphy are the other two. They'll be looking at a study of career ladders in Utah and already we've gotten some help from folks here. A number of people have already helped in terms of getting ready to document the changes in implementing career ladders. I think that's going to be a very important feature of what we do in the State.

Audience: Would LeRue elaborate on job descriptions?

Winget: You should include in your plan a typical job description. In other words, for elementary teacher, rather than a job description for every elementary teacher, one job description for that class of teachers, those who are teaching at the elementary level. Unless there's something unique about it for which you need to make a variation. The same thing, secondary, you may want to have a different one for middle school and high school. But, it's typical type of job descriptions.

Audience: At the time the career ladder concept was being discussed in the legislature, a comment was that the best teachers were being pulled out of the classroom and put into administrative positions in this career ladder. I would be interested in anyone who's been working with the design of it, are you able to avoid that?

Winget: I think that most of the additional assignments would be an extended year kind of assignment, or simply paying people for assignments they're already doing, such as department chairmen. We don't anticipate any assignments that would pull people out of the classroom. Other than if they participate in visitation of exemplary teachers or mentoring, or those kinds of things where there will be some time out of the classroom. But, not on a permanent or a regular basis.

Franklin: As we went through this we did as much as possible to keep the teacher in the classroom. The things that we're going to be asking of our professional teachers would be the types of reviewing of peer materials that could be done outside of regular school hours, in order that we could keep these people in the classroom. A dual purpose, one to keep them there and the other one to keep the cost down. But, we anticipate it would be a very limited number of individuals asked to leave the classroom to perform any duties in relationship to this.

Winget : I might just report quickly on Salt Lake and Provo. Let me start with Provo. Provo has what they call at the third and fourth levels, a teacher specialist, third level and teacher leader at the top level. Their plan is that the teacher specialist will be doing their helping of other teachers as an extended day. That is, they won't have any time given during

the day for that. But their teacher leaders will have some time. It may be a period or two, it may even go up to ten in some rare instances. Some of them will have released time. I think they have stated that it would be about, on the average, one-fourth of their time would be allowed. With Salt Lake City School District, they're putting their money on the teacher leader's level. And, I should mention also that in Provo the teacher leader will have some extended year time. With Salt Lake, they will not have specific time during the school year, except they'll receive up to eight days release time, with a substitute teacher. And then in the summer time, they'll have an extended contract.

Audience: One of the things that we sometimes forget that we are looking at our best teachers, higher level, the object is to help others do their job. Therefore, if we isolate them and say the only time they can do anything is after school, the effectiveness in helping new teachers is very limited. So, one of the things we're looking at is to have that person released to spend daily time perhaps with the first-year teacher who those of you who work with these people find that they really need the help continually. Work with that person in their classroom as almost a team situation, does pull them out of a class where they're teaching entirely, but it does allow them to work with someone who's new and use their abilities to influence a new teacher to move along very quickly. But, they have to do that during the day when they can actually be in the classroom, and not wait to try to do a summary job every evening.

Audience: Ken, you stated the position of Provo quite well, and I appreciate that. But, at the same time, what we're asking those teacher leaders which we call at the very top of the salary schedule and with the

rank from it, what kind of responsibilities they have. The question is can we perform those without some additional time. That's already a concern. Some people are saying, "Hey, you're asking me to walk on water, speak great truths, you've got to give me time to do that." Again, no one will be asked to leave the classroom more than...we're suggesting the guideline of twenty-five percent. At the same time, we're not forcing any teacher out of the classroom. Additionally, we're saying that none of that responsibility is administrative. That is, there's no bookkeeping. The reports are minimal. They're in the classroom, they're working with teachers during that time. And, if the payoff is what we anticipate, that is, quality, top-notch teachers working with teachers who can become that same kind of teacher. In the long run, perhaps even short term, that's the best investment of their time we can make.

Peterson: That's been a difficult issue. To look at the exemplary teacher and understand that they do their work in the classroom. But, also we want them to be able to in fluence the system somehow. And to make them available to work with the beginner, to help socialize them. And, I think that by raising the question about the main job for teachers is that they're working with kids and to keep raising that as we're developing new systems, is a good one. To keep that in mind. And, we've seen three or four approaches now to doing both things at the same time, and looks to be pretty exciting. We've got to keep raising that question, though.

Audience: I'm interested in the local autonomy thing. Each district has its own plan. I'm wondering if there's any perspective which suggests that down the road we'll see...some of these plans work very well and some don't work. Is there concern, fear, desire, to move toward more of an integrated system as we see that some of the systems work better than others?

Wilson: One of the ideas or suggestions that came out and the idea of allowing the local autonomy was again because the career ladder concept is relatively new. And I suspect as the program evolves and this dynamic approach takes place, that if there's a desire to have that happen, statutorily, then certainly the legislature is not beyond saying if there are some more specific guidelines and kinds of things that are working, that you want to do statutorily, then we would either put them in the statute or at least authorize the State Office of Education to develop some more specific guidelines in terms of the kinds of programs which should be going on throughout the State. But, at this point in time, I think again it's a matter of where they're saying, let's wait and see what happens and then depending upon how the system wants to go then we can go one way or the other.

Peterson: It's another issue we're going to have to pay attention to.

Audience: Well, I think two things are going to happen. One is that there'll be a tendency for good features to be copied by other districts if something does appear to work. And, secondly, that negotiations and the way that districts get together on items that they're going to negotiate, will tend to cause some pressures to bring about some similarities in terms of minimums you know, where one district may be expecting more, doing more, whatever, certain leveling affect based on the negotiation process. So, I think we will see some bringing together of the plans after a few years.

Audience: Along that line, I think that the smartest thing that we've done in this whole situation is to say the districts develop their own. If I'm building my own airplane and I know I'm going to be in it, I'll try to do the job that will help me get there. And, I'm sure the counsel of the legislature from setting down hard fast rules and mandating that because

immediately backs go up. Whereas if you develop it, I think the very thing that Tony is talking about is already happening. People are going over her and saying "What are you folks doing?" And I think that they will eventually set up their own system that will probably fly better than anything that's mandated that says you will do this, this and this.

Peterson: I want to thank the members of the panel. Thank you for coming today and for your participation. It is important as the concept of career ladders is developed in Utah that we continue working together to get the best out of them for public education.